

Reply to:—Interlayer Josephson vortices in the high- T_c superconducting cuprates

K. A. Moler

Department of Applied Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-4090

John R. Kirtley

IBM T.J. Watson Research Center, P.O. Box 218, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

Farid raises the issue [1] of whether the Clem-Coffey solution [2,3] is really appropriate to describe interlayer Josephson vortices in layered superconductors. We used this result to quantitatively analyze our images of interlayer vortices in the high-temperature layered cuprate superconductor Tl-2201 [4] in order to determine the interlayer penetration depth, λ_c . The length scales that appear in this model are the interlayer spacing s , the in-plane penetration depth λ_a , and λ_c . For most cuprate superconductors, a is a bit over 10 Å, λ_a is 0.1–0.2 microns, and λ_c can be microns and depends strongly on the detailed chemical composition of the material, varying greatly with small changes in oxygen doping. In the usual description of an interlayer Josephson vortex, the core extends a distance $\sim s$ perpendicular to the layers, and $\sim s\lambda_c/\lambda_a$ along the layers [2,3]: the field outside the core is described by the well-known anisotropic London model. For the sake of completeness in our paper, we fit our data using the Coffey-Clem model, which includes an approximate solution for the vortex core. Because our experiment is only sensitive to magnetic structure on micron length scales, the key features of this model are, first, that the length scale for the vortex core is less than a micron, and second, that the magnetic fields outside the vortex core are described by the anisotropic London model. Any other model with these two characteristics would give the same result for λ_c within experimental error.

Farid points out the lack of an exact solution for the difficult nonlinear problem of the structure of the vortex core, and implicitly speculates that the correct solution may turn out to influence the magnetic structure on length scales much larger than $s\lambda_c/\lambda_a$ and even much larger than λ_c . If this speculation is correct, our interpretation that our images of interlayer Josephson vortices are a direct measurement of the c -axis penetration depth, $\lambda_c \approx 20$ microns in optimally doped Tl-2201 [4], will be only one piece of a large body of related experimental and theoretical work that will need to be reevaluated. We look forward to the opportunity to fit our data to a theory including an exact treatment of both the vortex core and the spreading associated with the superconductor-vacuum interface.

On the basis of related experimental evidence, it seems unlikely to us that this exact theoretical solution will result in a qualitative reevaluation of our results. First, since our article [4] was published, two independent groups using different optical techniques have reported $\lambda_c = 17$ microns [5] and $\lambda_c = 12$ microns [6] in optimally doped Tl-2201. These results are both independent of the vortex structure. Second, we imaged vortices in the much-studied cuprate superconductor LSCO, and found $\lambda_c \approx 5$ microns [7]. This unpublished result is consistent with measurements by several other techniques [8]. Therefore, if the exact theoretical solution indicates that the size of an interlayer Josephson vortex is much larger than the interlayer penetration depth, it will contradict the combined experimental results of several groups on these two materials and will require a new understanding of the optical as well as the magnetic properties of layered superconductors.

It is a minor point that Farid misquotes our result as $\lambda_c \approx 22$ microns in Tl-2201, when our article stated “... we find $\lambda_c = 19 \pm 2$ microns. There are larger systematic errors, which we estimate to be $<30\%$...”. Incidentally, we have since studied what we view as the most likely source of systematic error, namely the spreading of the vortex at the superconductor-vacuum interface, and refined our estimate to $\lambda_c = 18 \pm 3$ microns [9].

Farid’s observation that fitting our data to the Clem-Coffey model does not give the correct values for s and λ_a should be taken as a limitation of the data, and not necessarily the theory. Our measurements are made a few microns away from the sample surface. The detector is an 8 micron SQUID, fabricated with micron line widths and shielded leads which may cause some distortion of the magnetic field [10]. The data points are spaced every 1 micron, and the scan-to-scan x -position is irreproducible on a 0.1-micron length scale due to the tradeoffs required to get a large area scan. It is unreasonable to expect a sensible answer about any structure on the 0.001 micron length scale or even the 0.1 micron length scale, no matter how exact one’s theoretical model.

Finally, Farid comments that the predicted relationship between E_J^0 and λ_c [11], which we refuted through our measurement of λ_c , may not do “justice to the ILT theory.” We are grateful for a chance to comment on this issue. Based on a comparison of the published predictions of one of the theory’s authors [11] with the available experimental data, ILT is not sufficient to explain the high critical temperature and condensation energy in the cuprate superconductors Tl-2201 [5] and Hg-1201 [12]. Some other mechanism must therefore be in operation, perhaps in addition to the ILT mechanism. In this sense, ILT is not “the” theory of cuprate superconductivity. The interlayer tunneling model remains a creative and influential set of ideas which may correctly describe some aspects of cuprate superconductivity, as intriguing new evidence suggests [6,13].

We thank J. Berlinsky, J. R. Clem, and V. Kogan for useful discussions.

-
- [1] B. Farid, *J. Phys. Cond. Matt.* **10**, L589–L596 (1998).
 - [2] W.E. Lawrence and S. Doniach, in *Proceeding of the 12th International Conference on Low Temperature Physics*, edited by E. Kanda (Academic Press, Kyoto, 1971), p. 361.
 - [3] J.R. Clem and M.W. Coffey, *Phys. Rev. B* **42**, 6209 (1990).
 - [4] K.A. Moler, J.R. Kirtley, D.G. Hinks, T.W. Li, M. Xu, *Science* **279**, 1193 (1998).
 - [5] A. A. Tsvetkov, D. van der Marel, K. A. Moler, J. R. Kirtley, J. L. de Boer, A. Meetsma, Z. F. Ren, N. Kolesnikov, D. Dulic, A. Damascelli, M. Grueninger, J. Schutzmann, J. W. van der Eb, H. S. Somal, J. H. Wang, *Nature* **395**, 360 (1998).
 - [6] D. Basov *et al*, unpublished.
 - [7] J.R. Kirtley, K.A. Moler, H. Takagi, unpublished.
 - [8] T. Shibauchi, H. Kitano, K. Uchinokura, A. Maeda, T. Kimura, K. Kishio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 2263 (1994); S. Uchida, K. Tamasaku, S. Tajima, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 14558 (1996).
 - [9] J.R. Kirtley, V.G. Kogan, J.R. Clem, K.A. Moler, *Phys. Rev. B*, in press (01 Feb 99).
 - [10] J.R. Kirtley, M.B. Ketchen, C.C. Tsuei, J.Z. Sun, W.J. Gallagher, L.S. Yu-Jahnes, A. Gupta, K.G. Stawiasz, S.J. Wind, *IBM J. of Res. and Dev.* **39**, 655 (1995).
 - [11] P.W. Anderson, *Science* **279**, 1196 (1998), and references therein.
 - [12] J.R. Kirtley, K.A. Moler, G. Villard, A. Maignan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 2140 (1998).
 - [13] S. Chakravarty, H.-Y. Lee, and E. Abrahams, “Frustrated kinetic energy, the optical sum rule, and the mechanism of superconductivity,” cond-mat/9811082.